



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,594	11/14/2003	Mohamed Attawia	3518.1012-005	3230

21005 7590 03/12/2007  
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.  
530 VIRGINIA ROAD  
P.O. BOX 9133  
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER
----------

STANDLEY, STEVEN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1649

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/12/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed 12/11/06 has been made of record. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code, not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

### ***Priority***

2. The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The disclosure of the prior-filed application, Application No. 10/456,948, fails to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for one or more claims of this application. The Examiner has considered Applicant's arguments concerning priority and finds that while application 10/456,948 contains prophetic teachings of treatment with mesenchymal cells, the prior art cited (Sakai et al., 2003) in rejections under both 35 USC § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, and 35 USC § 103 provides the only enabled aspects of the instant invention. In other words, the claims are only enabled to the extent that the prior art teaches the instant invention. Thus, the earliest time

Art Unit: 1649

at which the invention can be considered enabled by the prior art is at application 10/714,559, filed 11/13/03.

**Objections/Rejections: Withdrawn**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. Rejection of claims 1-7, 10-18, 20-24, and 31-32 under 35 USC § 112, 1<sup>st</sup>, written description, is withdrawn due to applicant's amendment.
4. Rejection of claim 24 under 35 USC § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, is withdrawn due to applicant's amendment.

**Objections/Rejections: Maintained/New Grounds**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Rejection of claim 1-7, 10-18, 20-24, and 31-32 under 35 USC § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, enablement is maintained for the reasons made of record in the office action dated 9/17/06. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and not found to be persuasive. Applicant argues first that amendment from 'autologous

Art Unit: 1649

cells' to 'mesenchymal cells' in claim 1 obviates the rejection. This is not persuasive because many of the other limitations outside the scope of enablement are not included in base claim 1 or any other claims. Applicant next argues that inclusion in claim 7 of a therapeutic agent which is a growth factor, and the recitation of TGF-Beta in claim 18 obviates the rejection. This is not found persuasive because some growth factors actually inhibit proliferation of chondrocytes, which would destroy the instant invention. For instance, both NGF and bFGF inhibit proliferation of chondrocytes both in vitro and in vivo (see Raucci et al, 2004). Thus, the method would not work with a generic growth factor. Applicant lastly argues on page 9 of Remarks that a carrier medium that does not cause retention of mesenchymal cells at the site of placement is useful. Since applicant is treating a degenerative disc disease, retention of mesenchymal cells at the locus of repair is an essential property. Moreover, Hyaluronan was found to be toxic to the cells at 15%. See Crevensten et al, page 433, right column.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which

Art Unit: 1649

said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Rejection of claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-16, 20-24 and 31 under 35 USC § 103(a) is maintained for the reasons made of record in the office action dated 9/17/06. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and not found to be persuasive. Applicant argues first that Sakai et al was published in September of 2003 and is thus not available as prior art. This is not found persuasive because the invention as claimed is not enabled prior to the publication of Sakai et al. Thus, it is not entitled to priority to the continuations in part as argued by applicant. Furthermore, the earliest publication of Sakai et al is as an abstract from the annual meeting of the international society for the study of lumbar spine (May, 2003). Applicant argues secondly that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to practice the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success based on the teachings of Sakai et al. This is not found persuasive because Sakai, in fact, practices a more difficult method in culturing mesenchymal cells in order to label them, but also in order to expand them, because Sakai et al demonstrate the viability of the cells after two weeks of culturing.

The motivation to concentrate and administer mesenchymal stem cells is that the procedure would take hours instead days. The expectation of success is, indeed, higher than that demonstrated by Sakai et al because there is less opportunity for contamination in a period of hours instead of days or weeks.

Art Unit: 1649

Applicant argues that the method of Sakai et al cannot be used as a therapeutic. This is not found persuasive because Sakai et al demonstrate the effectiveness of the treatment (see abstract of publication, or 'results' section of the annual meeting abstract (submitted in applicant's ids).

Applicant also argues on page 12 of Remarks that Sakai's culturing of stem cells would not be a desirable treatment because of the size of the resulting population would be too large. This is not persuasive because the method of Sakai et al is effective. The specification has not distinguished the method in any non-obvious sense from that of Sakai. Sakai et al has constructed the method in order to overcome the burden of proof that the cells are viable and alive and integrate into their environment. To do this, Sakai et al must culture them and label them with a fluorescent marker, which then facilitates identification of new cells that have integrated into the area. Sakai et al demonstrate that the instant method would obviously work, and do it prior to the priority of the instant application.

7. Claims 1-6, 10-16, 20-24, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai et al as applied to claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-16, 20-24, and 31 above, and further in view of Tanney et al (1980).

Sakai et al teaches as described above.

Sakai et al does not teach concentrating cells by filtration.

Tanney teaches concentrating cells by a filtration technique (see abstract).

One would have every expectation of success since the technique uses a 0.2 micrometer size exclusion pore that captures things over 0.2 micrometers and allows smaller things to pass.

One would be motivated to combine the references because the method of Tanney provides an easy way to concentrate cells with no impairment of organism viability (see abstract).

7. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-16, 18, 20-24, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai et al as applied to claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-16, 20-24, and 31 above, and further in view of Russell et al (May 2003 meeting abstract, in applicant's IDS).

Sakai teaches as described above.

Russell et al teach that bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells can be used as a source for treatment of disc degeneration as Sakai et al does. In addition, Russell et al teach using TGF-beta to stimulate chondrocyte differentiation (see results and discussion).

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the two references because TGF-beta stimulated mesenchymal cells were stimulated to differentiate into chondrocytic phenotype is critical to mimic disc like-cells.

The expectation of success is high because the instant invention uses the same TGF-beta with the same cell type for the same treatment.

8. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-17, 18, 20-24, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai et al as applied to claims 1-3, 5-



Art Unit: 1649

6, 10-16, 20-24, and 31 above, and further in view of Russell et al (may 2003 meeting abstract, in applicant's IDS).

Sakai et al and Russell et al teach as described above.

Sakai et al. and Russell et al do not teach a carrier comprised of microspheres.

However, carriers such as microspheres are well-known in the art, would have a reasonable expectation of success, and one would be motivated to use them because they would provide solid support for holding cells in the locus of delivery.

### **Conclusion**

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven H. Standley whose telephone number is (571) 272-3432. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Janet Andre can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steven Standley, Ph.D.

7/21/05

*James R. Rameo*  
JAMES R. RAMEO  
PATENT EXAMINER

